CHIBA-EP-195, 2012

A nonperturbative construction of massive Yang-Mills fields without the Higgs field

Kei-Ichi Kondo[1]
[1] *Department of Physics, Graduate School of Science, Chiba University, Chiba 263-8522, Japan*

In order to understand the so-called decoupling solution for gluon and ghost propagators in QCD, we give a nonperturbative construction of a massive vector field describing a non-Abelian massive spin-one particle, which has the correct physical degrees of freedom and is invariant under a modified BRST transformation, in a massive Yang-Mills model without the Higgs field, i.e., the Curci-Ferrari model. The resulting non-Abelian massive vector boson field is written using a nonlinear but local transformation from the original fields in the Curci-Ferrari model. As an application, we write down a local mass term for the Yang-Mills field and a dimension-two condensate, which are exactly invariant under the modified BRST transformation, Lorentz transformation and color rotation.

PACS numbers: 12.38.Aw, 21.65.Qr

arXiv:1208.3521v2 [hep-th] 14 Sep 2012

I. INTRODUCTION

In this paper we consider a massive Yang-Mills theory [1] without the Higgs field [2]. A motivation of this research stems from some non-perturbative phenomena caused by strong interactions.

- Confinement and Green functions: The deep infrared behaviors of the gluon and ghost Green functions are believed to be intimately connected to color confinement in QCD [3, 4]. In the Landau gauge, the decoupling solution [5] for the gluon and ghost propagators is currently supported rather than the scaling solution [6] by recent numerical simulations on large lattices in three and four spacetime dimensions [7]. Quite recently, it has been shown [8] that the decoupling solution for the gluon and ghost propagators can be well reproduced from a low-energy effective model of a massive Yang-Mills theory, which is a special case of the Curci-Ferrari (CF) model [9]. This feature is not restricted to the Landau gauge and is common to manifestly Lorentz covariant gauges, e.g., the maximal Abelian gauge [10], as pointed out and demonstrated in [11]. We can ask how color confinement in QCD is understood from the CF model.

- Glueball mass spectrum: Glueball should be constructed from the fundamental degrees of freedom of QCD, i.e., quark, gluon and ghost. For instance, the potential model of [12] identifies glueballs with bound states of massive gluons. They are described simply by introducing a naive mass term for gluons, $\frac{1}{2}M^2\mathscr{A}_\mu\cdot\mathscr{A}^\mu$, which however breaks the BRST symmetry. We ask how we can introduce a BRST-invariant mass term for gluons to establish a firm field theoretical foundation for treating glueballs, which will enable us to answer how precisely the mass and spin of the resulting glueballs are related to those of the constituent gluons.

- Vacuum condensates: Besides gauge-invariant vacuum condensates represented by $\langle\bar{\psi}\psi\rangle$ with mass dimension-three and $\langle\mathscr{F}_{\mu\nu}^2\rangle$ with mass dimension-four, which are very important to characterize the non-perturbative vacuum of QCD, there might exist an extra dimension-two condensate. In fact, such a lower dimensional vacuum condensate is needed from the phenomenological point of view. However, such a condensate cannot be constructed from gauge-invariant local composite operators in the framework of the local field theory. A BRST-invariant vacuum condensate of mass dimension-two has been constructed in [13, 14]. However, it is just on-shell BRST invariant. Can we construct an off-shell BRST invariant version of vacuum condensate of mass dimension-two?

Another motivation of studying the CF model comes from the field theoretical interest, since the massive Yang-Mills theory without the Higgs field has an unsatisfactory aspect as a quantum field theory. The renormalizability [15, 16] is an important criterion for a quantum field theory to be a calculable and predictable theory. In addition, the physical unitarity [15–25] is another important criterion for a quantum theory of gauge fields to be a meaning theory, which prevents unphysical particles from being observed.

In view of this, we remind the readers of the well-known facts:

- The massless Yang-Mills theory satisfies both the renormalizability and the physical unitarity [15].

- The massive Yang-Mills theory in which local gauge invariance is spontaneously broken by the Higgs field and the gauge field acquires the mass through the Higgs mechanism satisfies both the renormalizability and the physical unitarity [16].

In fact, the unified theory of Glashow-Weinberg-Salam for the electromagnetic and weak interactions based on the spontaneous symmetry breaking: $SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y \to U(1)_{EM}$ predicted the massive gauge bosons W^+, W^-, Z^0 which have been discovered in the mid 1980s, and the remaining Higgs particle is about to be discovered.

However, in all the models proposed so far as the massive Yang-Mills theory without the Higgs fields (in which the local gauge symmetry is not spontaneously broken), it seems that the renormalizability and the physical unitarity are not compatible with each other. See [24, 25] for reviews and [26] for later developments. Indeed, the CF model has been shown to be renormalizable [20, 22], whereas the CF model does not seem to satisfy the physical unitarity according to [20–22]. Although the CF model is not invariant under the usual BRST transformation, it can be made invariant by modifying the BRST transformation. But, the modified BRST transformation is not nilpotent.

It is known that the nilpotency is the key property to show the physical unitarity in the usual massless Yang-Mills theory, since the unphysical states form the BRST quartets and the cancellations occur among the quartets (Kugo-Ojima quartet mechanism) [3]. It is not so clear if the nilpotency is necessary to recover the physical unitarity in the massive case. The physical unitarity of the CF model will be discussed in the perturbative and a non-perturbative framework in forthcoming papers [27].

Finally, it is instructive to mention the Gribov-Zwanziger (GZ) model [28] and its modified version called the refined Gribov-Zwanziger (rGZ) model [29], in comparison with the CF model, since GZ and rGZ have been extensively studied in recent years to understand the scaling solution and the decoupling solution respectively. Common features to both models are as follows.

- Both models have a dimensionful parameter to be determined afterwards, i.e., the "mass" parameter M in the CF model and the Gribov parameter γ in the rGZ model.
- Both models are multiplicatively renormalizable to all orders of perturbation theory.
- Both models do not respect the BRST symmetry: The Lagrangian is not invariant under the BRST transformation.
- Both models do not have the proof of fulfilling physical unitarity.

An advantage of the CF model to the rGZ model is that the CF model is much simpler than the rGZ model in the following sense.

- The CF model has the same field contents as those in the original Yang-Mills theory, while the rGZ model has additional unfamiliar fields introduced to rewrite the original non-local GZ model into a local field theory.
- The CF model can explain the decoupling solution using one parameter M, while the rGZ model needs one more parameter which is related to the dimension-two condensate of the extra field (called the Zwanziger ghost), which is a non-local quantity in the original theory.
- The CF model has the modified BRST symmetry [9] which remains a local symmetry and reduces to the usual BRST symmetry in the limit $M \to 0$, while the GZ model has differently modified BRST symmetries which become inevitably non-local [30, 31].

This paper is organized as follows. In section II, we obtain the modified BRST and anti-BRST transformation for the CF model. Although the result was already known in the CF paper [9], we give a constructive derivation of the modified BRST transformation to see how the resulting modification of the BRST transformation is unique under certain conditions.

In section III, using the fact that the CF model respects color symmetry, we rewrite the field equation of the Yang-Mills field in the Maxwell-like form. This is an important technical tool needed in the next section to construct the massive vector field.

In section IV, we construct a non-Abelian massive vector field describing a massive spin-one particle, which has the correct physical degrees of freedom and is invariant under a modified BRST transformation, from the Curci-Ferrari model without the Higgs field. The resulting massive vector boson field is written using a nonlinear but local transformation from the original fields in the Curci-Ferrari model. This is the main result. As an application, we write down the mass term for the Yang-Mills field and a dimension-two condensate, which are invariant simultaneously under the modified BRST transformation, Lorentz transformation and color rotation.

In Appendix A, we give a proof that the path-integration measure is invariant under the modified BRST transformation. In Appendix B, we show that even the modified BRST (anti anti-BRST) invariant quantity depends on a parameter β in the $M \neq 0$ case. This should be compared with the $M = 0$ case, in which β is a gauge-fixing parameter and the BRST-invariant quantity does not depend on β, which means that the physics does not depend on β in the $M = 0$ case. This is not the case for $M \neq 0$.

II. THE CURCI-FERRARI MODEL AND THE MODIFIED BRST SYMMETRY

As a candidate of the massive Yang-Mills theory without the Higgs field, we start from the Lagrangian density of the usual massless Yang-Mills theory in the most general Lorentz gauge [32] plus the "mass term" $\mathscr{L}_m$:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathscr{L}^{\rm tot}_{m{\rm YM}} =&\mathscr{L}_{\rm YM} + \mathscr{L}_{\rm GF+FP} + \mathscr{L}_m,\\ \mathscr{L}_{\rm YM} =&-\frac{1}{4}\mathscr{F}_{\mu\nu}\cdot\mathscr{F}^{\mu\nu}, \end{aligned}\tag{1a}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathscr{L}_{\rm GF+FP} =&\frac{\beta}{2}\mathscr{N}\cdot\mathscr{N} + \mathscr{N}\cdot\partial^\mu\mathscr{A}_\mu - \frac{\beta}{2}g\mathscr{N}\cdot(i\bar{\mathscr{C}}\times\mathscr{C})\\ &+ i\bar{\mathscr{C}}\cdot\partial^\mu\mathscr{D}_\mu[\mathscr{A}]\mathscr{C} + \frac{\beta}{4}g^2(i\bar{\mathscr{C}}\times\mathscr{C})\cdot(i\bar{\mathscr{C}}\times\mathscr{C})\\ =&\mathscr{N}\cdot\partial^\mu\mathscr{A}_\mu + i\bar{\mathscr{C}}\cdot\partial^\mu\mathscr{D}_\mu[\mathscr{A}]\mathscr{C}\\ &+\frac{\beta}{4}(\bar{\mathscr{N}}\cdot\bar{\mathscr{N}} + \mathscr{N}\cdot\mathscr{N}),\end{aligned}\tag{1b}$$

$$\mathscr{L}_m =\frac{1}{2}M^2\mathscr{A}_\mu\cdot\mathscr{A}^\mu + \beta M^2 i\bar{\mathscr{C}}\cdot\mathscr{C},\tag{1c}$$

where β is a parameter corresponding to a gauge-fixing parameter in the $M \to 0$ limit,[1] $\mathscr{D}_\mu$ is the covariant derivative defined by

$$\mathscr{D}_\mu[\mathscr{A}]\omega(x) := \partial_\mu\omega(x) + g\mathscr{A}(x)\times\omega(x),\tag{2}$$

and $\bar{\mathscr{N}}$ is defined by

$$\bar{\mathscr{N}} := -\mathscr{N} + gi\bar{\mathscr{C}}\times\mathscr{C}.\tag{3}$$

Here the total Lagrangian density is written in terms of the Yang-Mills field $\mathscr{A}_\mu$, the Faddeev-Popov (FP) ghost field $\mathscr{C}$, antighost field $\bar{\mathscr{C}}$ and the Nakanishi-Lautrup (NL) field $\mathscr{N}$, if we use the terminology in the usual massless Yang-Mills theory. This is the Curci-Ferrari (CF) model [9]. In the Abelian limit with vanishing structure constants $f^{ABC} = 0$, the FP ghosts decouple and the CF model reduces to the Nakanishi model [33].

The original Yang-Mills Lagrangian $\mathscr{L}_{\rm YM}$ is invariant under the gauge transformation:

$$\delta\mathscr{A}_\mu(x) = \mathscr{D}_\mu[\mathscr{A}]\omega(x).\tag{4}$$

We remember that $\mathscr{L}_{\rm YM}+\mathscr{L}_{\rm GF+FP}$ is constructed so as to be invariant under both the usual BRST transformation:

$$\begin{cases}\boldsymbol{\delta}\mathscr{A}_\mu(x) = \mathscr{D}_\mu[\mathscr{A}]\mathscr{C}(x)\\ \boldsymbol{\delta}\mathscr{C}(x) = -\frac{g}{2}\mathscr{C}(x)\times\mathscr{C}(x)\\ \boldsymbol{\delta}\bar{\mathscr{C}}(x) = i\mathscr{N}(x)\\ \boldsymbol{\delta}\mathscr{N}(x) = 0\end{cases},\tag{5}$$

and anti-BRST transformation:

$$\begin{cases}\bar{\boldsymbol{\delta}}\mathscr{A}_\mu(x) = \mathscr{D}_\mu[\mathscr{A}]\bar{\mathscr{C}}(x)\\ \bar{\boldsymbol{\delta}}\bar{\mathscr{C}}(x) = -\frac{g}{2}\bar{\mathscr{C}}(x)\times\bar{\mathscr{C}}(x)\\ \bar{\boldsymbol{\delta}}\mathscr{C}(x) = i\bar{\mathscr{N}}(x)\\ \bar{\boldsymbol{\delta}}\bar{\mathscr{N}}(x) = 0\end{cases}.\tag{6}$$

Indeed, it is checked that both $\mathscr{L}_{\rm YM}$ and $\mathscr{L}_{\rm GF+FP}$ are invariant under the BRST and anti-BRST transformations:

$$\boldsymbol{\delta}\mathscr{L}_{\rm YM} = 0,\quad \boldsymbol{\delta}\mathscr{L}_{\rm GF+FP} = 0,\tag{7}$$

$$\bar{\boldsymbol{\delta}}\mathscr{L}_{\rm YM} = 0,\quad \bar{\boldsymbol{\delta}}\mathscr{L}_{\rm GF+FP} = 0.\tag{8}$$

We try to introduce a mass term $\mathscr{L}_m$ so that the total Lagrangian $\mathscr{L}^{\rm tot}_{m\rm YM}$ remains invariant under the BRST transformation. However, we will find that the total Lagrangian is no longer invariant under the usual BRST transformation, once the "mass term" $\mathscr{L}_m$ is introduced into the Yang-Mills theory. Indeed, we observe for a specific choice $\beta = 0$:

$$\boldsymbol{\delta}\mathscr{L}_m = M^2\partial^\mu\mathscr{C}\cdot\mathscr{A}_\mu \neq 0,\tag{9}$$

where we have used $(\mathscr{A}_\mu\times\mathscr{A}^\mu)^A = g^{\mu\nu}(\mathscr{A}_\mu\times\mathscr{A}_\nu)^A = g^{\mu\nu}f^{ABC}\mathscr{A}^B_\mu\mathscr{A}^C_\nu = 0$.

In what follows, therefore, we consider if the total Lagrangian can be made invariant by modifying the BRST transformation. For this purpose, we reexamine the BRST invariance of the GF+FP term, and we try to find such a modified BRST transformation $\boldsymbol{\delta}'$.

Suppose that the modified BRST transformation $\boldsymbol{\delta}'$ of $\mathscr{A}_\mu$ has the same form as the usual BRST transformation:

$$\boldsymbol{\delta}'\mathscr{A}_\mu(x) = \mathscr{D}_\mu[\mathscr{A}]\mathscr{C}(x),\tag{10}$$

to guarantee the invariance of the original Yang-Mills action:

$$\boldsymbol{\delta}'\mathscr{L}_{\rm YM} = 0.\tag{11}$$

In order to realize $\boldsymbol{\delta}'\mathscr{L}^{\rm tot}_{\rm mYM} = 0$, we require

$$0 = \boldsymbol{\delta}'(\mathscr{L}_{\rm GF+FP} + \mathscr{L}_m).\tag{12}$$

Here we cannot require the invariance of the respective part, $\mathscr{L}_{\rm GF+FP}$ or $\mathscr{L}_m$, since we observe below that the choice (10) inevitably leads to $\boldsymbol{\delta}'\mathscr{L}_m \neq 0$, which means $\boldsymbol{\delta}'\mathscr{L}_{\rm GF+FP} \neq 0$ to guarantee $\boldsymbol{\delta}'\mathscr{L}^{\rm tot}_{\rm mYM} = 0$.

First, we consider the $\beta = 0$ case for simplicity. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}\boldsymbol{\delta}'\mathscr{L}_{\rm GF+FP} =&\boldsymbol{\delta}'(\mathscr{N}\cdot\partial^\mu\mathscr{A}_\mu + i\bar{\mathscr{C}}\cdot\partial^\mu\mathscr{D}_\mu[\mathscr{A}]\mathscr{C})\\ =&\boldsymbol{\delta}'\mathscr{N}\cdot\partial^\mu\mathscr{A}_\mu + \mathscr{N}\cdot\partial^\mu\mathscr{D}_\mu[\mathscr{A}]\mathscr{C}\\ &+ i\boldsymbol{\delta}'\bar{\mathscr{C}}\cdot\partial^\mu\mathscr{D}_\mu[\mathscr{A}]\mathscr{C} - i\bar{\mathscr{C}}\cdot\partial^\mu\boldsymbol{\delta}'\boldsymbol{\delta}'\mathscr{A}_\mu,\end{aligned}\tag{13}$$

while

$$\boldsymbol{\delta}'\mathscr{L}_m = M^2\partial^\mu\mathscr{C}\cdot\mathscr{A}_\mu = -M^2\mathscr{C}\cdot\partial^\mu\mathscr{A}_\mu \neq 0.\tag{14}$$

In order to determine the modified BRST transformation for other fields, we perform:

$$\begin{aligned}&\boldsymbol{\delta}'(\mathscr{L}_{\rm GF+FP} + \mathscr{L}_m)\\ =&(\boldsymbol{\delta}'\mathscr{N} - M^2\mathscr{C})\cdot\partial^\mu\mathscr{A}_\mu + (\mathscr{N} + i\boldsymbol{\delta}'\bar{\mathscr{C}})\cdot\partial^\mu\mathscr{D}_\mu[\mathscr{A}]\mathscr{C}\\ &- i\bar{\mathscr{C}}\cdot\partial^\mu\mathscr{D}_\mu[\mathscr{A}](\boldsymbol{\delta}'\mathscr{C} + \frac{g}{2}\mathscr{C}\times\mathscr{C}),\end{aligned}\tag{15}$$

---

[1] We can add a term $\frac{\alpha}{2}\mathscr{N}\cdot\mathscr{N}$ with another gauge fixing parameter α.

where we have used:

$$\begin{aligned}\boldsymbol{\delta}'\boldsymbol{\delta}'\mathscr{A}_\mu &= \boldsymbol{\delta}'(\mathscr{D}_\mu\mathscr{C}) \\ &= \boldsymbol{\delta}'(\partial_\mu\mathscr{C} + g\mathscr{A}_\mu \times \mathscr{C}) \\ &= \partial_\mu\boldsymbol{\delta}'\mathscr{C} + g(\mathscr{D}_\mu\mathscr{C}) \times \mathscr{C} + g\mathscr{A}_\mu \times \boldsymbol{\delta}'\mathscr{C} \\ &= \mathscr{D}_\mu\boldsymbol{\delta}'\mathscr{C} + \frac{g}{2}(\mathscr{D}_\mu\mathscr{C} \times \mathscr{C} + \mathscr{C} \times \mathscr{D}_\mu\mathscr{C}) \\ &= \mathscr{D}_\mu\left[\boldsymbol{\delta}'\mathscr{C} + \frac{g}{2}(\mathscr{C} \times \mathscr{C})\right]. \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

The requirement (12) is satisfied, if we adopt

$$\boldsymbol{\delta}'\mathscr{N} = M^2\mathscr{C}, \quad \boldsymbol{\delta}'\bar{\mathscr{C}} = i\mathscr{N}, \quad \boldsymbol{\delta}'\mathscr{C} = -\frac{g}{2}(\mathscr{C} \times \mathscr{C}). \tag{17}$$

Thus we have found a modified BRST transformation:

$$\begin{cases}\boldsymbol{\delta}'\mathscr{A}_\mu(x) = \mathscr{D}_\mu[\mathscr{A}]\mathscr{C}(x), \\ \boldsymbol{\delta}'\mathscr{C}(x) = -\frac{g}{2}\mathscr{C}(x) \times \mathscr{C}(x), \\ \boldsymbol{\delta}'\bar{\mathscr{C}}(x) = i\mathscr{N}(x), \\ \boldsymbol{\delta}'\mathscr{N}(x) = M^2\mathscr{C}, \end{cases} \tag{18}$$

which deforms the BRST transformation of the NL field and reduces to the usual BRST transformation in the limit $M \to 0$. It should be remarked that

$$\boldsymbol{\delta}'\mathscr{L}_m \neq 0, \quad \boldsymbol{\delta}'\mathscr{L}_{\text{GF+FP}} \neq 0. \tag{19}$$

Similarly, the total action is shown to be invariant under a modified anti-BRST transformation $\bar{\boldsymbol{\delta}}'$ defined by

$$\begin{cases}\bar{\boldsymbol{\delta}}'\mathscr{A}_\mu(x) = \mathscr{D}_\mu[\mathscr{A}]\bar{\mathscr{C}}(x), \\ \bar{\boldsymbol{\delta}}'\bar{\mathscr{C}}(x) = -\frac{g}{2}\bar{\mathscr{C}}(x) \times \bar{\mathscr{C}}(x), \\ \bar{\boldsymbol{\delta}}'\mathscr{C}(x) = i\bar{\mathscr{N}}(x), \\ \bar{\boldsymbol{\delta}}'\bar{\mathscr{N}}(x) = -M^2\bar{\mathscr{C}}(x), \end{cases} \tag{20}$$

which reduces to the usual anti-BRST transformation in the limit $M \to 0$. It is sometimes useful to give another form:

$$\begin{aligned}\boldsymbol{\delta}'\bar{\mathscr{N}}(x) =& g\bar{\mathscr{N}}(x) \times \mathscr{C}(x) - M^2\mathscr{C}(x), \\ \bar{\boldsymbol{\delta}}'\mathscr{N}(x) =& g\mathscr{N}(x) \times \bar{\mathscr{C}}(x) + M^2\bar{\mathscr{C}}(x). \end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

However, the modified BRST transformation violates the nilpotency:

$$\begin{cases}\boldsymbol{\delta}'\boldsymbol{\delta}'\mathscr{A}_\mu(x) = 0, \\ \boldsymbol{\delta}'\boldsymbol{\delta}'\mathscr{C}(x) = 0, \\ \boldsymbol{\delta}'\boldsymbol{\delta}'\bar{\mathscr{C}}(x) = i\boldsymbol{\delta}'\mathscr{N}(x) = iM^2\mathscr{C}(x) \neq 0, \\ \boldsymbol{\delta}'\boldsymbol{\delta}'\mathscr{N}(x) = M^2\boldsymbol{\delta}'\mathscr{C}(x) = -M^2\frac{g}{2}\mathscr{C}(x) \times \mathscr{C}(x) \neq 0. \end{cases} \tag{22}$$

The nilpotency is violated also for the modified anti-BRST transformation:

$$\begin{cases}\bar{\boldsymbol{\delta}}'\bar{\boldsymbol{\delta}}'\mathscr{A}_\mu(x) = 0, \\ \bar{\boldsymbol{\delta}}'\bar{\boldsymbol{\delta}}'\bar{\mathscr{C}}(x) = 0, \\ \bar{\boldsymbol{\delta}}'\bar{\boldsymbol{\delta}}'\mathscr{C}(x) = i\bar{\boldsymbol{\delta}}'\bar{\mathscr{N}}(x) = -iM^2\bar{\mathscr{C}}(x) \neq 0, \\ \bar{\boldsymbol{\delta}}'\bar{\boldsymbol{\delta}}'\bar{\mathscr{N}}(x) = -M^2\bar{\boldsymbol{\delta}}'\bar{\mathscr{C}}(x) = M^2\frac{g}{2}\bar{\mathscr{C}}(x) \times \bar{\mathscr{C}}(x). \end{cases} \tag{23}$$

In the limit $M \to 0$, the modified BRST and anti-BRST transformations reduce to the usual BRST and anti-BRST transformations and become nilpotent.

Moreover, it is checked that the modified BRST and modified anti-BRST transformations no longer anticommute in the $M \neq 0$ case:

$$\begin{cases}\{\boldsymbol{\delta}', \bar{\boldsymbol{\delta}}'\}\mathscr{A}_\mu(x) = 0, \\ \{\boldsymbol{\delta}', \bar{\boldsymbol{\delta}}'\}\mathscr{C}(x) = -iM^2\mathscr{C}(x), \\ \{\boldsymbol{\delta}', \bar{\boldsymbol{\delta}}'\}\bar{\mathscr{C}}(x) = iM^2\bar{\mathscr{C}}(x), \\ \{\boldsymbol{\delta}', \bar{\boldsymbol{\delta}}'\}\mathscr{N}(x) = 0. \end{cases} \tag{24}$$

In the limit $M \to 0$, the anticommutativity is recovered, $\{\boldsymbol{\delta}', \bar{\boldsymbol{\delta}}'\} \to 0$.

Next, we consider the $\beta \neq 0$ case. By using the modified BRST transformation, $\mathscr{L}_{\text{GF+FP}}$ is rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathscr{L}_{\text{GF+FP}} \\ =& -\boldsymbol{\delta}\left[i\bar{\mathscr{C}} \cdot \left(\partial^\mu\mathscr{A}_\mu + \frac{\beta}{2}\mathscr{N} - \frac{\beta}{4}gi\bar{\mathscr{C}} \times \mathscr{C}\right)\right] \\ =& -\boldsymbol{\delta}'\left[i\bar{\mathscr{C}} \cdot \left(\partial^\mu\mathscr{A}_\mu + \frac{\beta}{2}\mathscr{N} - \frac{\beta}{4}gi\bar{\mathscr{C}} \times \mathscr{C}\right)\right] \\ &- i\bar{\mathscr{C}} \cdot \frac{\beta}{2}\boldsymbol{\delta}'\mathscr{N} \\ =& -\boldsymbol{\delta}'\left[i\bar{\mathscr{C}} \cdot \left(\partial^\mu\mathscr{A}_\mu + \frac{\beta}{2}\mathscr{N} - \frac{\beta}{4}gi\bar{\mathscr{C}} \times \mathscr{C}\right)\right] \\ &- \frac{\beta}{2}M^2 i\bar{\mathscr{C}} \cdot \mathscr{C} \\ =& i\boldsymbol{\delta}'\bar{\boldsymbol{\delta}}'\left(\frac{1}{2}\mathscr{A}^\mu \cdot \mathscr{A}_\mu + \frac{\beta}{2}i\bar{\mathscr{C}} \cdot \mathscr{C}\right) - \frac{\beta}{2}M^2 i\bar{\mathscr{C}} \cdot \mathscr{C}. \end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

Using the fact that only the transformation of the NL field $\boldsymbol{\delta}'\mathscr{N}$ is modified in the modified BRST transformation, we find

$$\begin{aligned}&\boldsymbol{\delta}'\mathscr{L}_{\text{GF+FP}} \\ &= \boldsymbol{\delta}'\mathscr{N} \cdot \partial^\mu\mathscr{A}_\mu + \beta\boldsymbol{\delta}'\mathscr{N} \cdot \mathscr{N} - \frac{g}{2}\beta\boldsymbol{\delta}'\mathscr{N} \cdot (i\bar{\mathscr{C}} \times \mathscr{C}) \\ &= M^2\mathscr{C} \cdot \partial^\mu\mathscr{A}_\mu + \beta M^2\mathscr{C} \cdot \mathscr{N} - \frac{g}{2}\beta M^2\mathscr{C} \cdot (i\bar{\mathscr{C}} \times \mathscr{C}) \\ &= M^2\mathscr{C} \cdot \partial^\mu\mathscr{A}_\mu + \beta M^2\left[\mathscr{N} \cdot \mathscr{C} - i\bar{\mathscr{C}} \cdot \frac{g}{2}(\mathscr{C} \times \mathscr{C})\right] \\ &= -M^2\boldsymbol{\delta}'\left(\frac{1}{2}\mathscr{A}_\mu \cdot \mathscr{A}^\mu\right) - \beta M^2\boldsymbol{\delta}'(i\bar{\mathscr{C}} \cdot \mathscr{C}). \end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

Therefore, a simple choice of the β-dependent mass term $\mathscr{L}_m$ satisfying $\boldsymbol{\delta}'(\mathscr{L}_{\text{GF+FP}} + \mathscr{L}_m) = 0$ is indeed given by

$$\mathscr{L}_m = \frac{1}{2}M^2\mathscr{A}_\mu \cdot \mathscr{A}^\mu + \beta M^2 i\bar{\mathscr{C}} \cdot \mathscr{C}. \tag{27}$$

Moreover, the path-integral integration measure $\mathcal{D}\mathscr{A}\mathcal{D}\mathscr{C}\mathcal{D}\bar{\mathscr{C}}\mathcal{D}\mathscr{N}$ is invariant under the modified BRST transformation. Indeed, it is shown in Appendix that the Jacobian associated to the change of integration variables $\Phi(x) \to \Phi'(x) = \Phi(x) + \lambda\boldsymbol{\delta}'\Phi(x)$ for the integration measure is equal to one.

III. FIELD EQUATIONS AND COLOR SYMMETRY

The field equations are obtained as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\delta \mathscr{L}^{\rm tot}}{\delta \mathscr{A}^\mu} =& \mathscr{D}^\nu[\mathscr{A}]\mathscr{F}_{\nu\mu} - \partial_\mu \mathscr{N} + gi\partial_\mu \bar{\mathscr{C}} \times \mathscr{C} \\
& + M^2 \mathscr{A}_\mu + g J_\mu = 0, \\
\frac{\delta \mathscr{L}^{\rm tot}}{\delta \mathscr{N}} =& \partial^\mu \mathscr{A}_\mu + \beta \mathscr{N} - \frac{\beta}{2} gi\bar{\mathscr{C}} \times \mathscr{C} = 0, \\
\frac{\delta \mathscr{L}^{\rm tot}}{i\delta \bar{\mathscr{C}}} =& \partial^\mu \mathscr{D}_\mu[\mathscr{A}]\mathscr{C} - \frac{\beta}{2} g\bar{\mathscr{N}} \times \mathscr{C} + \beta M^2 \mathscr{C} = 0, \\
\frac{\delta \mathscr{L}^{\rm tot}}{\delta \mathscr{C}} =& - \mathscr{D}_\mu[\mathscr{A}]i\partial^\mu \bar{\mathscr{C}} - \frac{\beta}{2} g\bar{\mathscr{N}} \times i\bar{\mathscr{C}} - \beta M^2 i\bar{\mathscr{C}} = 0,
\end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

where we have used the left derivative and defined the matter current J_μ by

$$J_\mu^A := g^{-1} \frac{\partial \mathscr{L}_{\rm matter}}{\partial \mathscr{A}^{\mu A}} = -i(T^A \varphi)_a \frac{\partial \mathscr{L}^{\rm tot}}{\partial(\partial^\mu \varphi_a)}. \tag{29}$$

We observe that the total Lagrangian of the CF model is invariant under the (infinitesimal) **global gauge transformation** or **color rotation** defined by

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta\Phi(x) &:= [\varepsilon^C iQ^C, \Phi(x)] = \varepsilon \times \Phi(x), & (30) \\
& \text{for} \quad \Phi = \mathscr{A}_\mu, \mathscr{N}, \mathscr{C}, \bar{\mathscr{C}}, \\
\delta\varphi(x) &:= [\varepsilon^C iQ^C, \varphi(x)] = -i\varepsilon\varphi(x), & (31)
\end{aligned}$$

or

$$\begin{aligned}
& \delta\Phi^A(x) = f^{ABC}\varepsilon^B \Phi^C(x), \\
& \delta\varphi_a(x) = -i\varepsilon^A (T^A)_a{}^b \varphi_b(x) = -i\varepsilon^A (T^A\varphi)_a.
\end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

The associated conserved Noether current $\mathscr{J}^\mu$ is obtained from

$$\begin{aligned}
& \varepsilon \cdot \mathscr{J}^\mu_{\rm color} \\
=& \delta\mathscr{A}_\nu \cdot \frac{\partial \mathscr{L}}{\partial(\partial_\mu \mathscr{A}_\nu)} + \delta\mathscr{C} \cdot \frac{\partial \mathscr{L}}{\partial(\partial_\mu \mathscr{C})} + \delta\bar{\mathscr{C}} \cdot \frac{\partial \mathscr{L}}{\partial(\partial_\mu \bar{\mathscr{C}})} \\
& + \delta\mathscr{N} \cdot \frac{\partial \mathscr{L}}{\partial(\partial_\mu \mathscr{N})} + \delta\varphi \cdot \frac{\partial \mathscr{L}}{\partial(\partial_\mu \varphi)} \\
=& (\varepsilon \times \mathscr{A}_\nu) \cdot \mathscr{F}^{\nu\mu} + (\varepsilon \times \mathscr{C}) \cdot (i\partial^\mu \bar{\mathscr{C}}) \\
& + (\varepsilon \times \bar{\mathscr{C}}) \cdot (-i\mathscr{D}^\mu[\mathscr{A}]\mathscr{C}) + (\varepsilon \times \mathscr{N}) \cdot (-\mathscr{A}^\mu) + J^\mu \cdot \varepsilon \\
=& \varepsilon \cdot (\mathscr{A}_\nu \times \mathscr{F}^{\nu\mu}) + \varepsilon \cdot (\mathscr{C} \times i\partial^\mu \bar{\mathscr{C}}) - \varepsilon \cdot (i\bar{\mathscr{C}} \times \mathscr{D}^\mu[\mathscr{A}]\mathscr{C}) \\
& + \varepsilon \cdot (\mathscr{A}^\mu \times \mathscr{N}) + \varepsilon \cdot J^\mu.
\end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

Thus the Noether current $\mathscr{J}^\mu$ associated with the color symmetry which is conserved $\partial_\mu \mathscr{J}^\mu_{\rm color} = 0$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathscr{J}^\mu_{\rm color} \\
=& \mathscr{A}_\nu \times \mathscr{F}^{\nu\mu} + \mathscr{C} \times i\partial^\mu \bar{\mathscr{C}} - i\bar{\mathscr{C}} \times \mathscr{D}^\mu[\mathscr{A}]\mathscr{C} + \mathscr{A}^\mu \times \mathscr{N} \\
& + J^\mu \\
=& \mathscr{A}_\nu \times \mathscr{F}^{\nu\mu} + i\partial^\mu \bar{\mathscr{C}} \times \mathscr{C} - \mathscr{D}^\mu[\mathscr{A}]\mathscr{C} \times i\bar{\mathscr{C}} + \mathscr{A}^\mu \times \mathscr{N} \\
& + J^\mu.
\end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

The conserved Noether charge $Q^A := \int d^3x J^{\mu=0,A}_{\rm color}$ obtained from the color current $\mathscr{J}^0_{\rm color}$ is called the **color charge** and is equal to the generator of the color rotation. Note that $\mathscr{J}^\mu_{\rm color}$ has the same expression as the massless case, irrespective of $M = 0$ or $M \neq 0$.

Remember that

$$\begin{aligned}
i\boldsymbol{\delta}'\bar{\boldsymbol{\delta}}'\mathscr{A}_\mu &= \boldsymbol{\delta}'(\mathscr{D}_\mu[\mathscr{A}]i\bar{\mathscr{C}}) \\
&= \boldsymbol{\delta}'(\partial_\mu i\bar{\mathscr{C}} + g\mathscr{A}_\mu \times i\bar{\mathscr{C}}) \\
&= -\partial^\mu \mathscr{N} + g\mathscr{D}_\mu[\mathscr{A}]\mathscr{C} \times i\bar{\mathscr{C}} - g\mathscr{A}_\mu \times \mathscr{N},
\end{aligned} \tag{35}$$

which has the same form for $M = 0$ and $M \neq 0$. Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& g\mathscr{J}^\mu_{\rm color} + i\boldsymbol{\delta}'\bar{\boldsymbol{\delta}}'\mathscr{A}^\mu \\
=& g\mathscr{A}_\nu \times \mathscr{F}^{\nu\mu} - \partial^\mu \mathscr{N} + gi\partial^\mu \bar{\mathscr{C}} \times \mathscr{C} + gJ^\mu.
\end{aligned} \tag{36}$$

Using this result, we find that the equation of motion for $\mathscr{A}_\mu$ is cast into the Maxwell-like form:

$$\partial_\nu \mathscr{F}^{\nu\mu} + g\mathscr{J}^\mu_{\rm color} + i\boldsymbol{\delta}'\bar{\boldsymbol{\delta}}'\mathscr{A}^\mu + M^2\mathscr{A}^\mu = 0. \tag{37}$$

IV. DEFINING A MASSIVE YANG-MILLS FIELD

We require the following properties to construct a non-Abelian massive spin-one vector boson field $\mathscr{K}_\mu(x)$ in a non-perturbative way:

(i) $\mathscr{K}_\mu$ has the modified BRST-invariance (off mass shell):

$$\boldsymbol{\delta}'\mathscr{K}_\mu = 0. \tag{38}$$

(ii) $\mathscr{K}_\mu$ is divergenceless (on mass shell):

$$\partial^\mu \mathscr{K}_\mu = 0. \tag{39}$$

(iii) $\mathscr{K}_\mu$ obeys the adjoint transformation under the color rotation:

$$\mathscr{K}_\mu(x) \to U\mathscr{K}_\mu(x)U^{-1}, \quad U = \exp[i\varepsilon^A Q^A], \tag{40}$$

which has the infinitesimal version:

$$\delta\mathscr{K}_\mu(x) = \varepsilon \times \mathscr{K}_\mu(x). \tag{41}$$

The field $\mathscr{K}_\mu$ is identified with the non-Abelian version of the physical massive vector field with spin one, as assured by the above properties. Here (i) guarantees that $\mathscr{K}_\mu$ belong to the physical field creating a physical state with positive norm. (ii) guarantees that $\mathscr{K}_\mu$ have the correct degrees of freedom as a massive spin-one particle, i.e., three in the four-dimensional spacetime, i.e., two transverse and one longitudinal modes, excluding one scalar mode. (iii) guarantees that $\mathscr{K}_\mu$ obey the same transformation rule as that of the original gauge field $\mathscr{A}_\mu$.

We find such a field $\mathscr{K}_\mu$ is obtained by a nonlinear but local transformation from the original fields $\mathscr{A}_\mu$, $\mathscr{C}$, $\bar{\mathscr{C}}$ and $\mathscr{N}$ of the CF model:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathscr{K}_\mu :=& \mathscr{A}_\mu - M^{-2}\partial_\mu\mathscr{N} - gM^{-2}\mathscr{A}_\mu \times \mathscr{N} \\ &+ gM^{-2}\partial_\mu\mathscr{C} \times i\bar{\mathscr{C}} + g^2M^{-2}(\mathscr{A}_\mu \times \mathscr{C}) \times i\bar{\mathscr{C}}.\end{aligned} \tag{42}$$

In the Abelian limit or the lowest order of the coupling constant g, $\mathscr{K}_\mu$ reduces to the Proca field for massive vector:

$$\mathscr{K}_\mu \to \mathscr{A}_\mu - \frac{1}{M^2}\partial_\mu\mathscr{N} := U_\mu. \tag{43}$$

The new field $\mathscr{K}_\mu$ is converted to a simple form:

$$\mathscr{K}_\mu(x) = \mathscr{A}_\mu(x) + \frac{1}{M^2} i\boldsymbol{\delta}'\bar{\boldsymbol{\delta}}'\mathscr{A}_\mu(x). \tag{44}$$

In fact, the definition (44) for $\mathscr{K}_\mu$ is equal to (42):

$$\begin{aligned}\mathscr{K}_\mu &= \mathscr{A}_\mu + \frac{i}{M^2}\boldsymbol{\delta}'(\partial_\mu\bar{\mathscr{C}} + g\mathscr{A}_\mu \times \bar{\mathscr{C}}) \\ &= \mathscr{A}_\mu + \frac{i}{M^2}(i\partial_\mu\mathscr{N} + g\mathscr{D}_\mu[\mathscr{A}]\mathscr{C} \times \bar{\mathscr{C}} + g\mathscr{A}_\mu \times i\mathscr{N}) \\ &= \mathscr{A}_\mu - \frac{1}{M^2}(\partial_\mu\mathscr{N} + g\mathscr{A}_\mu \times \mathscr{N} - g\mathscr{D}_\mu[\mathscr{A}]\mathscr{C} \times i\bar{\mathscr{C}}) \\ &= \mathscr{A}_\mu - \frac{1}{M^2}\partial_\mu\mathscr{N} - \frac{g}{M^2}\mathscr{A}_\mu \times \mathscr{N} + \frac{g}{M^2}\partial_\mu\mathscr{C} \times i\bar{\mathscr{C}} \\ &\quad + \frac{g^2}{M^2}(\mathscr{A}_\mu \times \mathscr{C}) \times i\bar{\mathscr{C}}.\end{aligned} \tag{45}$$

The above properties required for the field $\mathscr{K}_\mu$ are checked as follows.

(i) This is because

$$\begin{aligned}&\boldsymbol{\delta}'\mathscr{K}_\mu \\ &= \boldsymbol{\delta}'\mathscr{A}_\mu + \frac{i}{M^2}\boldsymbol{\delta}'\boldsymbol{\delta}'(\partial_\mu\bar{\mathscr{C}} + g\mathscr{A}_\mu \times \bar{\mathscr{C}}) \\ &= \boldsymbol{\delta}'\mathscr{A}_\mu + \frac{i}{M^2}\boldsymbol{\delta}'(\partial_\mu\boldsymbol{\delta}'\bar{\mathscr{C}} + g\boldsymbol{\delta}'\mathscr{A}_\mu \times \bar{\mathscr{C}} + g\mathscr{A}_\mu \times \boldsymbol{\delta}'\bar{\mathscr{C}}) \\ &= \boldsymbol{\delta}'\mathscr{A}_\mu + \frac{i}{M^2}(\partial_\mu\boldsymbol{\delta}'^2\bar{\mathscr{C}} + g\boldsymbol{\delta}'^2\mathscr{A}_\mu \times \bar{\mathscr{C}} - g\boldsymbol{\delta}'\mathscr{A}_\mu \times \boldsymbol{\delta}'\bar{\mathscr{C}} \\ &\qquad\qquad + g\boldsymbol{\delta}'\mathscr{A}_\mu \times \boldsymbol{\delta}'\bar{\mathscr{C}} + g\mathscr{A}_\mu \times \boldsymbol{\delta}'^2\bar{\mathscr{C}}) \\ &= \boldsymbol{\delta}'\mathscr{A}_\mu + \frac{i}{M^2}\mathscr{D}_\mu[\mathscr{A}]\boldsymbol{\delta}'^2\bar{\mathscr{C}} = 0,\end{aligned} \tag{46}$$

where we have used $\bar{\boldsymbol{\delta}}'\mathscr{A}_\mu = \mathscr{D}_\mu[\mathscr{A}]\bar{\mathscr{C}}$, $\boldsymbol{\delta}'^2\mathscr{A}_\mu = 0$, $\boldsymbol{\delta}'^2\bar{\mathscr{C}} = iM^2\mathscr{C}$, and $\boldsymbol{\delta}'\mathscr{A}_\mu = \mathscr{D}_\mu[\mathscr{A}]\mathscr{C}$.

(ii) The field equation is obtained:

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\delta\mathscr{L}^{\text{tot}}}{\delta\mathscr{A}^\mu} =& \mathscr{D}^\nu[\mathscr{A}]\mathscr{F}_{\nu\mu} - \partial_\mu\mathscr{N} + gi\partial_\mu\bar{\mathscr{C}} \times \mathscr{C} \\ &+ M^2\mathscr{A}_\mu + gJ_\mu = 0,\end{aligned} \tag{47}$$

where we have used the left derivative and defined the matter current J_μ by

$$J_\mu^A = -i(T^A\varphi)_a \frac{\partial\mathscr{L}^{\text{tot}}}{\partial(\partial^\mu\varphi_a)}. \tag{48}$$

The Noether current associated with color symmetry, which is conserved in the sense $\partial_\mu\mathscr{J}^\mu_{\text{color}} = 0$, is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\mathscr{J}^\mu_{\text{color}} =& \mathscr{A}_\nu \times \mathscr{F}^{\nu\mu} + i\partial^\mu\bar{\mathscr{C}} \times \mathscr{C} - \mathscr{D}^\mu[\mathscr{A}]\mathscr{C} \times i\bar{\mathscr{C}} \\ &+ \mathscr{A}^\mu \times \mathscr{N} + J^\mu.\end{aligned} \tag{49}$$

Using this result, the equation of motion for $\mathscr{A}_\mu$ is cast into the Maxwell-like form:

$$\partial_\nu\mathscr{F}^{\nu\mu} + g\mathscr{J}^\mu_{\text{color}} + i\boldsymbol{\delta}'\bar{\boldsymbol{\delta}}'\mathscr{A}^\mu + M^2\mathscr{A}^\mu = 0. \tag{50}$$

This indeed leads to

$$\begin{aligned}\partial^\mu\mathscr{K}_\mu &= \partial^\mu\left(\mathscr{A}_\mu + \frac{1}{M^2}i\boldsymbol{\delta}'\bar{\boldsymbol{\delta}}'\mathscr{A}_\mu\right) \\ &= \frac{-1}{M^2}\partial^\mu(\partial^\nu\mathscr{F}_{\nu\mu} + g\mathscr{J}_\mu^{\text{color}}) \\ &= \frac{-1}{M^2}(\partial^\mu\partial^\nu\mathscr{F}_{\nu\mu} + g\partial^\mu\mathscr{J}_\mu^{\text{color}}) = 0,\end{aligned} \tag{51}$$

where we have used $\partial^\mu\partial^\nu\mathscr{F}_{\nu\mu} = -\partial^\mu\partial^\nu\mathscr{F}_{\mu\nu} = 0$ and $\partial^\mu\mathscr{J}_\mu^{\text{color}} = 0$.

(iii) This is trivial from the Lie-algebra form:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathscr{K}_\mu =& \mathscr{A}_\mu - \frac{1}{M^2}\partial_\mu\mathscr{N} + i\frac{g}{M^2}[\mathscr{A}_\mu, \mathscr{N}] - i\frac{g}{M^2}[\partial_\mu\mathscr{C}, i\bar{\mathscr{C}}] \\ &- \frac{g^2}{M^2}[[\mathscr{A}_\mu, \mathscr{C}], i\bar{\mathscr{C}}].\end{aligned} \tag{52}$$

As an immediate application of the above result, we can construct a mass term which is invariant simultaneously under the modified BRST transformation, Lorentz transformation and color rotation:

$$\frac{1}{2}M^2\mathscr{K}_\mu(x) \cdot \mathscr{K}^\mu(x). \tag{53}$$

This can be useful as a regularizations scheme for avoiding infrared divergences in non-Abelian gauge theories. Moreover, we can obtain a dimension-two condensate which is modified BRST invariant, Lorentz-invariant and color-singlet:

$$\langle\mathscr{K}_\mu(x) \cdot \mathscr{K}^\mu(x)\rangle. \tag{54}$$

This dimension-two condensate is off-shell (modified) BRST invariant and should be compared with the dimension-two condensate proposed in [13, 14]:

$$\langle\frac{1}{2}\mathscr{A}_\mu(x) \cdot \mathscr{A}^\mu(x) + \beta\mathscr{C}(x) \cdot \bar{\mathscr{C}}(x)\rangle, \tag{55}$$

which is only on-shell BRST invariant.

The original CF Lagrangian $\mathscr{L}^{\rm tot}_{\rm mYM}[\mathscr{A}_\mu, \mathscr{C}, \bar{\mathscr{C}}, \mathscr{N}]$ is written in terms of $\mathscr{A}_\mu, \mathscr{C}, \bar{\mathscr{C}}$ and $\mathscr{N}$. The new theory is specified by $\mathscr{L}^{\rm tot}_{\rm mYM}[\mathscr{K}_\mu, \mathscr{C}, \bar{\mathscr{C}}, \mathscr{N}]$ written in terms of $\mathscr{K}_\mu, \mathscr{C}, \bar{\mathscr{C}}$ and $\mathscr{N}$ with the symmetry:

$$\begin{cases} \boldsymbol{\delta}'\mathscr{K}_\mu(x) = 0 \\ \boldsymbol{\delta}'\mathscr{C}(x) = -\frac{g}{2}\mathscr{C}(x) \times \mathscr{C}(x) \\ \boldsymbol{\delta}'\bar{\mathscr{C}}(x) = i\mathscr{N}(x) \\ \boldsymbol{\delta}'\mathscr{N}(x) = M^2\mathscr{C}(x) \end{cases} . \tag{56}$$

The proposed model opens a path of resolving the long-standing problem of reconciling physical unitarity with renormalizability without Higgs fields. The physical unitarity of the CF model will be discussed in forthcoming papers [27].

Acknowledgements — This work is supported by Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (C) 24540252 from Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (JSPS).

Appendix A: Invariance of the path-integration measure

In the massive Yang-Mills theory, the path-integral integration measure defined by

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathcal{D}\mathscr{A}\mathcal{D}\mathscr{C}\mathcal{D}\bar{\mathscr{C}}\mathcal{D}\mathscr{N} \\ &= \prod_{x,\mu,A} d\mathscr{A}^A_\mu(x) \prod_{x,A} d\mathscr{C}^A(x) \prod_{x,A} d\bar{\mathscr{C}}^A(x) \prod_{x,A} d\mathscr{N}^A(x) \end{aligned} \tag{A1}$$

is invariant under the modified BRST transformation. This fact is shown as follows. For the change of integration variables $\Phi(x) \to \Phi'(x) = \Phi(x) + \lambda\boldsymbol{\delta}'\Phi(x)$, the integration measure is transformed as

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathcal{D}\mathscr{A}'\mathcal{D}\mathscr{C}'\mathcal{D}\bar{\mathscr{C}}'\mathcal{D}\mathscr{N}' = J\mathcal{D}\mathscr{A}\mathcal{D}\mathscr{C}\mathcal{D}\bar{\mathscr{C}}\mathcal{D}\mathscr{N}, \\ J =&{\rm Det}\begin{bmatrix} \frac{\delta\mathscr{A}'^A_\mu(x)}{\delta\mathscr{A}^B_\nu(y)} & \frac{\delta\mathscr{A}'^A_\mu(x)}{\delta\mathscr{C}^B(y)} & \frac{\delta\mathscr{A}'^A_\mu(x)}{\delta\bar{\mathscr{C}}^B(y)} & \frac{\delta\mathscr{A}'^A_\mu(x)}{\delta\mathscr{N}^B(y)} \\ \frac{\delta\mathscr{C}'^A(x)}{\delta\mathscr{A}^B_\nu(y)} & \frac{\delta\mathscr{C}'^A(x)}{\delta\mathscr{C}^B(y)} & \frac{\delta\mathscr{C}'^A(x)}{\delta\bar{\mathscr{C}}^B(y)} & \frac{\delta\mathscr{C}'^A(x)}{\delta\mathscr{N}^B(y)} \\ \frac{\delta\bar{\mathscr{C}}'^A(x)}{\delta\mathscr{A}^B_\nu(y)} & \frac{\delta\bar{\mathscr{C}}'^A(x)}{\delta\mathscr{C}^B(y)} & \frac{\delta\bar{\mathscr{C}}'^A(x)}{\delta\bar{\mathscr{C}}^B(y)} & \frac{\delta\bar{\mathscr{C}}'^A(x)}{\delta\mathscr{N}^B(y)} \\ \frac{\delta\mathscr{N}'^A(x)}{\delta\mathscr{A}^B_\nu(y)} & \frac{\delta\mathscr{N}'^A(x)}{\delta\mathscr{C}^B(y)} & \frac{\delta\mathscr{N}'^A(x)}{\delta\bar{\mathscr{C}}^B(y)} & \frac{\delta\mathscr{N}'^A(x)}{\delta\mathscr{N}^B(y)} \end{bmatrix} \end{aligned} \tag{A2}$$

The Jacobian J is calculated as

$$\begin{aligned} J =&{\rm Det}\begin{bmatrix} \delta_{\mu\nu}(\delta^{AB} + \lambda g f^{ABC}\mathscr{C}^C) & \lambda\mathscr{D}^{AB}_\mu[\mathscr{A}] & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \delta^{AB} - \lambda g f^{ABC}\mathscr{C}^C & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \delta^{AB} & \lambda i\delta^{AB} \\ 0 & \lambda M^2\delta_{AB} & 0 & \delta_{AB} \end{bmatrix} \\ &\times \delta^D(x-y) \\ =&{\rm Det}\begin{bmatrix} \delta_{\mu\nu}(\delta^{AB} + \lambda g f^{ABC}\mathscr{C}^C) & \lambda\mathscr{D}^{AB}_\mu[\mathscr{A}] & 0 \\ 0 & \delta^{AB} - \lambda g f^{ABC}\mathscr{C}^C & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \delta^{AB} \end{bmatrix} \\ &\times \delta^D(x-y) \\ &\quad + (\lambda M^2)\cdot{\rm Det}\begin{bmatrix} \delta_{\mu\nu}(\delta^{AB} + \lambda g f^{ABC}\mathscr{C}^C) & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \delta^{AB} & \lambda i\delta^{AB} \end{bmatrix} \\ &\times \delta^D(x-y) \\ =&{\rm Det}[\delta_{\mu\nu}\delta^D(x-y)(\delta^{AB} + \lambda g f^{ABC}\mathscr{C}^C)] \\ &\times {\rm Det}[\delta^D(x-y)(\delta^{AB} - \lambda g f^{ABC}\mathscr{C}^C)] \\ =&1. \end{aligned} \tag{A3}$$

Appendix B: β dependence

We have shown that $\mathscr{L}_{\rm GF+FP}$ is written as

$$\mathscr{L}_{\rm GF+FP} = i\boldsymbol{\delta}'\bar{\boldsymbol{\delta}}'\left(\frac{1}{2}\mathscr{A}^\mu\cdot\mathscr{A}_\mu + \frac{\beta}{2}i\bar{\mathscr{C}}\cdot\mathscr{C}\right) - \frac{\beta}{2}M^2 i\bar{\mathscr{C}}\cdot\mathscr{C}, \tag{B1}$$

while

$$\mathscr{L}_m = \frac{1}{2}M^2\mathscr{A}_\mu\cdot\mathscr{A}^\mu + \beta M^2 i\bar{\mathscr{C}}\cdot\mathscr{C}. \tag{B2}$$

Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathscr{L}_{\rm GF+FP} + \mathscr{L}_m =& i\boldsymbol{\delta}'\bar{\boldsymbol{\delta}}'\left(\frac{1}{2}\mathscr{A}^\mu\cdot\mathscr{A}_\mu + \frac{\beta}{2}i\bar{\mathscr{C}}\cdot\mathscr{C}\right) \\ &+ \frac{\beta}{2}M^2 i\bar{\mathscr{C}}\cdot\mathscr{C} + \frac{1}{2}M^2\mathscr{A}_\mu\cdot\mathscr{A}^\mu. \end{aligned} \tag{B3}$$

Let W be the generating functional of the connected Green functions defined from the vacuum functional $Z[J]$ with the source J for an operator $\mathscr{O}$ as a functional of Φ:

$$\begin{aligned} e^{iW[J]} := Z[J] := &\int \mathcal{D}\mathscr{A}\mathcal{D}\mathscr{C}\mathcal{D}\bar{\mathscr{C}}\mathcal{D}\mathscr{N} \\ &\times \exp\left\{iS^{\rm tot}_{m\rm YM} + i\int d^Dx J(x)\cdot\mathscr{O}(x)\right\}. \end{aligned} \tag{B4}$$

Then the average of the operator $\mathscr{O}$ is obtained from

$$\langle\mathscr{O}(x)\rangle = \frac{\delta}{\delta J(x)}W[J]\Big|_{J=0} = \frac{1}{i}\frac{\delta}{\delta J(x)}\ln Z[J]\Big|_{J=0}. \tag{B5}$$

First, we consider the derivative of W with respect to β given by

$$\frac{\partial W[J]}{\partial\beta} = \frac{1}{i}\frac{\partial\ln Z[J]}{\partial\beta} = \frac{1}{i}Z[J]^{-1}\frac{\partial Z[J]}{\partial\beta} = \Big\langle\frac{\partial S^{\rm tot}_{m\rm YM}}{\partial\beta}\Big\rangle_J, \tag{B6}$$

where

$$\frac{\partial S^{\rm tot}_{m{\rm YM}}}{\partial \beta} = \int d^D x \left[i\boldsymbol{\delta}'\bar{\boldsymbol{\delta}}' \left(\frac{1}{2} i\bar{\mathscr{C}} \cdot \mathscr{C} \right) + \frac{1}{2} M^2 i\bar{\mathscr{C}} \cdot \mathscr{C} \right]. \tag{B7}$$

If we adopt the modified Kugo-Ojima subsidiary condition or the modified BRST invariance of the vacuum:

$$Q'_{\rm BRST}|0\rangle = 0, \tag{B8}$$

we find the β dependence of $W[J]$:

$$\frac{\partial W[J]}{\partial \beta} = \int d^D x \frac{1}{2} M^2 \langle i\bar{\mathscr{C}}(x) \cdot \mathscr{C}(x) \rangle_J \neq 0 \tag{B9}$$

Therefore, for $M \neq 0$, $W[J]$ depends on the parameter β. This result should be compared with the $M = 0$ case, in which β is a gauge fixing parameter and hence $W[J]$ should not depend on β. In the $M = 0$ case, any choice of β gives the same $W[J]$. However, this is not the case for $M \neq 0$.

Next, we consider the average of the operator $\mathscr{O}$:

$$\langle \mathscr{O}(x) \rangle = Z^{-1} \int \mathcal{D}\mathscr{A}\mathcal{D}\mathscr{C}\mathcal{D}\bar{\mathscr{C}}\mathcal{D}\mathscr{N} e^{iS^{\rm tot}_{m{\rm YM}}} \mathscr{O}(x), \tag{B10}$$

where $Z := Z[J = 0]$. The β-derivative is given by

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \beta} \langle \mathscr{O}(x) \rangle = \left\langle \mathscr{O}(x); i\frac{\partial S^{\rm tot}_{m{\rm YM}}}{\partial \beta} \right\rangle, \tag{B11}$$

where we have defined the connected expectation value $\langle A; B \rangle := \langle AB \rangle - \langle A \rangle \langle B \rangle$. Even if the operator $\mathscr{O}$ is modified BRST invariant, i.e., $\boldsymbol{\delta}'\mathscr{O} = 0$, the average $\langle \mathscr{O}(x) \rangle$ depends on β for $M \neq 0$:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \beta} \langle \mathscr{O}(x) \rangle = i\frac{1}{2} M^2 \int d^D y \left\langle \mathscr{O}(x); i\bar{\mathscr{C}}(y) \cdot \mathscr{C}(y) \right\rangle \neq 0. \tag{B12}$$

The β dependence of the CF model was pointed out also in [34] using different arguments.

[1] C.N. Yang and R.L. Mills, Phys. Rev. **96**, 191(1954).

[2] P.W. Higgs, Phys. Rev. **145**, 1156(1966).

[3] T. Kugo and I. Ojima, Suppl. Prog. Theor. Phys. **66**, 1(1979).

[4] V.N. Gribov. Nucl Phys. B**139**, 1(1978).

[5] Ph. Boucaud, J.P. Leroy, A. Le Yaouanc, J. Micheli, O. Pene and J. Rodriguez-Quintero, [hep-ph/0803.2161], JHEP 0806, 099 (2008).
A.C. Aguilar, D. Binosi and J. Papavassiliou, arXiv:0802.1870[hep-ph], Phys.Rev.D**78**, 025010 (2008).
C.S. Fischer, A. Maas and J.M. Pawlowski, arXiv:0810.1987 [hep-ph], Annals Phys.**324**, 2408(2009).
J. Braun, H. Gies and J.M. Pawlowski, arXiv:0708.2413 [hep-th], Phys. Lett. B**684**, 262(2010).

[6] R. Alkofer and L. von Smekal, [hep-ph/0007355], Phys. Rep. **353**, 281(2001).

[7] I.L. Bogolubsky, E.M. Ilgenfritz, M. Muller-Preussker and A. Sternbeck, arXiv:0710.1968 [hep-lat], PoS LAT2007, 290 (2007).
A. Cucchieri and T. Mendes, arXiv:0710.0412 [hep-lat], PoS LAT2007, 297 (2007).
A. Sternbeck, L. von Smekal, D.B. Leinweber and A.G. Williams, arXiv:0710.1982 [hep-lat] PoS LAT2007, 340 (2007).

[8] M. Tissier and N. Wschebor, arXiv:1105.2475 [hep-th], Phys. Rev. D**84**, 045018 (2011).
M. Tissier and N. Wschebor, arXiv:1004.1607 [hep-ph], Phys. Rev. D**82**, 101701 (2010).
J. Serreau and M. Tissier, arXiv:1202.3432 [hep-th]

[9] G. Curci and R. Ferrari, Nuovo Cim. A**32**, 151(1976).

[10] T. Mendes, A. Cucchieri and A. Mihara, [hep-lat/0611002], AIP Conf. Proc.**892**, 203(2007).

[11] K.-I. Kondo, arXiv:1103.3829 [hep-th], Phys. Rev. D**84**, 061702 (2011).

[12] J.M. Cornwall, Phys. Rev. D**26**, 1453(1982).
J.M. Cornwall and A. Soni, Phys. Lett. B**120**, 431(1983).

[13] K.-I. Kondo, [hep-th/0105299], Phys. Lett. B**514**, 335(2001).
K.-I. Kondo, [hep-th/0306195], Phys. Lett. B**572**, 210(2003).

[14] K.-I. Kondo, T. Murakami, T. Shinohara and T. Imai, [hep-th/0111256], Phys. Rev. D**65**, 085034 (2002).

[15] G. 't Hooft, Nucl. Phys. B**33**, 173(1971).

[16] G. 't Hooft, Nucl. Phys. B**35**, 167(1971).

[17] H. van Dam and M.J.G. Veltman, Nucl. Phys. B**22**, 397(1970).

[18] A.A. Slavnov and L.D. Faddeev, Theor. Math. Phys. **3**, 312(1970) [Teor. Mat. Fiz. **3**, 18(1970)].
A.A. Slavnov, Theor. Math. Phys. **10**, 201(1972) [Teor. Mat. Fiz. **10**, 305(1972)].

[19] D.G. Boulware, Annals Phys. **56**, 140(1970).

[20] G. Curci and R. Ferrari, Nuovo Cim. A**35**, 1(1976), Erratum-ibid. A**47**, 555 (1978).

[21] I. Ojima, Z. Phys. C**13**, 173(1982).

[22] J. de Boer, K. Skenderis, P. van Nieuwenhuizen and A. Waldron, Phys. Lett. B**367**, 175(1996).

[23] T. Kunimasa and T. Goto, Prog. Theor. Phys. **37**, 452(1967).
T. Fukuda, M. Monda, M. Takeda and Kan-ichi Yokoyama, Prog. Theor. Phys. **66**, 1827(1981).

[24] R. Delbourgo, S. Twisk and G. Thompson, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A**3**, 435(1998).

[25] H. Ruegg and M. Ruiz-Altaba, [hep-th/0304245], Int. J. Mod. Phys. A**19**, 3265(2004).

[26] R. Ferrari, arXiv:1106.5537 [hep-ph].
D. Bettinelli, R. Ferrari and A. Quadri, arXiv:0903.0281 [hep-th], Phys. Rev. D79, 125028 (2009), Erratum-ibid. D85, 049903 (2012).
D. Bettinelli, R. Ferrari and A. Quadri, arXiv:0809.1994 [hep-th], Acta Phys. Polon B41, 597–628 (2010).
D. Bettinelli, R. Ferrari and A. Quadri, arXiv:0709.0644 [hep-th], Phys. Rev. D77, 105012 (2008).
D. Bettinelli, R. Ferrari and A. Quadri, arXiv:0705.2339 [hep-th], Phys. Rev. D77, 045021 (2008).

R. Ferrari and A. Quadri, hep-th/0408168, JHEP 0411, 019 (2004).

[27] K.-I. Kondo, arXiv:1202.4162 [hep-th], to be revised and papers in preparation.

[28] D. Zwanziger, Nucl. Phys. B**323**, 513(1989).

[29] D. Dudal, J.A. Gracey, S.P. Sorella, N. Vandersickel and H. Verschelde, arXiv:0806.4348 [hep-th], Phys.Rev.D**78**, 065047 (2008).
N. Vandersickel and D. Zwanziger, arXiv:1202.1491 [hep-th].

[30] S.P. Sorella, arXiv:0905.1010[hep-th], Phys.Rev.D**80**, 025013 (2009).

[31] K.-I. Kondo, arXiv:0905.1899[hep-th].

[32] L. Baulieu, Phys. Rept. **129**, 1(1985).

[33] N. Nakanishi, Phys. Rev. D**5**, 1324(1972).

[34] P.M. Lavrov, Mod.Phys.Lett. A**27**, 1250132 (2012).